LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH — R. P. D.

TEHERAN FOLLOW-UP — Ivor Montagu

THE U.S.A. AND TEHERAN — Frank Pitcairn

THE WAR WORKER AND THE SECOND FRONT — J. R. Campbell

CORSICA AND THE LIBERATION OF FRANCE — Clemens Dutt

AMERICAN TRADE UNION UNITY

AGRICULTURE IN 1944 — Jack Dunman

STUDENTS AND THE WAR — Val Walker

BOOK REVIEWS

PREPARING THE OFFENSIVE

6D

FEBRUARY 1944

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVI. No. 2

CONTENTS

February, 1944

	Page
Notes of the Month—*Preparing the Offensive* by R. P. D.	33
Teheran Follow-up by IVOR MONTAGU	41
The U.S.A. and Teheran by FRANK PITCAIRN	44
The War Worker and the Second Front by J. R. CAMPBELL	46
Corsica and the Liberation of France by CLEMENS DUTT	49
American Trade Union Unity	53
Agriculture in 1944 by JACK DUNMAN	57
Students and the War by VAL WALKER	60
Book Reviews—	
The Colonies by G.P.	63
Racial Theory Exposed by BEN BRADLEY	64
Shorter Notices by J. H. H.	64

A New Labour Monthly Pamphlet

THE MOSLEY CASE

by

D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.

Price 6d.

Obtainable everywhere, or direct from the Publishers—

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Teheran on the March—Towards the Offensive—Are We Ready?—No Illusions—Production Problems—Post-War Policy—By-Election Lessons—True and False National Unity—What is Needed?—Political Situation After Teheran—Basic Change—Twenty Years—A Lesson Learned—Military Collaboration—Political Collaboration—United States Issues—President Roosevelt's Address—American Communists' Policy—Leninism in Action—Conclusions for Britain—Our Way Forward

THE year of great changes has begun. Already in the first weeks the new currents in Europe and the world have made themselves felt, as the sweeping advance of the Red Army is accompanied by the active preparations of the Western offensive. From the Balkans to France the breath of liberation is in the air. Bulgaria and Rumania in crisis. Polish reaction in the last ditch, as the plain necessity of fighting Hitler or refusing to fight Hitler becomes inescapable. Marshal Tito and the Jugoslav National Defence Council effectively recognised by the Allies. President Benes returns from Moscow with the Soviet-Czech Treaty as the bulwark of peace in Eastern Europe. The Italian Advisory Commission meets in Naples, and the first steps are begun towards democratic liberation to replace the strait-waistcoat of Amgot. Churchill meets De Gaulle on a cordial basis, while the French Consultative Parliament in Algiers presses the demand for more arms, for decisive action against the traitors, and for strengthened recognition of the French National Committee. President Roosevelt, in the most confident fighting Message to Congress since the onset of the war, proclaims the plain tasks of victory and lashes out at "Rightist reaction" and "the spirit of Fascism at home." Teheran is on the march.

BUT this is no moment for jubilation over what has been accomplished, or is being accomplished. We cannot afford to under-estimate the military and political tasks on whose fulfilment the realisation of the aims of Teheran depend. We cannot afford to under-estimate the magnitude of what is likely to be involved in the successful operation of the Western offensive, or what will be required from the people of this country as the advance base for the assault on Europe. We cannot afford to under-estimate the political strengthening which will be necessary, alike in the Government, in many fields of policy and in the mobilisation of the people, if we are to accomplish successfully the tasks of the next few months and bring down to earth those aims of victory and liberation and world co-operation which Teheran holds out. At this moment the prospect of the offensive must govern every issue. It is from this standpoint that we need to review the position of production and the political situation. In this final phase, on the eve of the offensive whose date has been agreed, such a review must carry vital lessons for action.

CAN we be satisfied that there is readiness for the great tasks of the final offensive and of victory, not only in the military field, but in every field of the war effort, in production, in the composition of the Government, in policy, in the outlook of the people, in united understanding of war aims and peace aims, in political mobilisation and in the unity of the Government and the people. A candid answer to this problem will reveal reasons for concern. There is no question of the united and unbreakable anti-Fascist will and determination of the people. The overwhelming mass response on the Mosley issue has demonstrated this anew most recently. Indeed, the weakness there revealed lay rather in the failure of the Government to understand and respond to this deep anti-Fascist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feeling of the people. The people are for the offensive; they demanded it ahead of the Government; they will meet without flinching whatever it may bring, even though there is still far from general realisation of the severity of the test that may be involved in this final encounter for the destruction of a still formidable and ruthless enemy. But it is when the question is carried beyond this elementary will to victory over Fascism that the issues of concern arise.

TEHERAN has brought a great perspective which makes new every issue of the world situation and of the future of the peoples. Has this perspective and all that it means been popularised, or has it been left to formal acceptance and the discussion of the experts? Has its meaning been brought to general popular consciousness, so that it can inspire the coming battles and the will to victory with the vision of the future? For if indeed it had been, it would mean many changes in policy which have still to take place. The spirit of Teheran and the deadlock in India go ill together. It would mean necessary changes in the composition of the Government, corresponding to the basic turn in policy which it represents. The Second Front has been accepted and is being prepared. But is the understanding of the people being prepared, with sober realism, for all that these final battles may bring and may require in united effort and sacrifice? For if it were, there would be a stronger understanding of the need of national unity as something more than an electoral device to protect safe seats (no longer so safe) for superannuated party hacks; and there would be a stronger determination to overcome every obstacle which still impedes the war effort.

IN the field of production the coal crisis—falsely hushed up last autumn in the interests of political tranquility—grows every day more urgent, and, as the recent cuts both for industry and for domestic consumption have indicated, holds out alarming prospects for the coming critical months, if more effective measures are not rapidly adopted. Yet the proposals of the miners are brushed aside in favour of dilatory half-measures which do not yet touch the root problem of an effective unified control capable of overriding the sectional financial interests that stand in the way of maximum production. The rail transport situation, equally vital with coal for the success of the Second Front, gives grave cause for concern already now before the gruelling test of the opening of the Western offensive. In the whole field of industry the provocative actions of reactionary sections of the employers, publicly admitted by the Government, create a dangerous situation; yet up to the present not a single employer, guilty of such offences or of open defiance of the provisions of the Essential Work Order, has been prosecuted and sent to prison, as hundreds of workers have been. Is it surprising that in such conditions wide numbers of politically less enlightened workers see first and foremost the issues of the domestic class struggle, in preparation for the prospective conflicts after the war, rather than the overshadowing issue of the life-and-death battle against Fascism for human freedom and the whole future of the working-class movement?

A DEEP controversy develops over post-war policies. It is no use declaring that such questions are "controversial" and must therefore be shelved until after the war. For, in fact, the immediate measures which will operate in the first stage of post-war reconstruction have to be hammered out and legislated now, within the conditions of national unity. Every policy, including the absence of a policy and refusal to attempt a solution (which is in reality

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also a policy, the policy of maintaining as much as possible the *status quo* of Tory reaction and monopoly in possession) is inevitably controversial. Hence the solution needs to be sought, not along the path of formal absence of controversy (which in practice generates the bitterest controversy), but along the path of courageous tackling of the concrete problems on the basis of the national interest, that is, the interests of the masses of the people, irrespective of sectional interests, and in the light of the agreed principles and general framework of post-war reconstruction adopted at Teheran and in the Atlantic Charter.

THESE questions are vital, not merely for after the war, but in the war. They are vital to the millions of soldiers who are concerned that demobilisation shall not mean what it meant at the end of the last war, and that they can be confident to return to jobs, and to worthwhile jobs and improved standards. They are vital to the millions of men and women in war industry, who look with anxiety to the prospects of the future on the day when the war industries are closed down. The interminable delays and negative attitude of the Government to elementary urgent measures of post-war reconstruction (Beveridge, control of land, housing, plans for full employment), inevitably spread the conviction that the monopoly interests are blocking and will be able to block any effective measures, and thus breed cynicism and defeatism in relation to the prospect of victory. Hence a bold and positive policy on these issues is vital for the success of the offensive.

WHAT of the political situation? In the first by-election of the year the Government candidate, supported by the mandate of the leaders of the three major parties composing the National Government, is defeated, not in a scratch vote, but in the remarkably high poll, for the present conditions of the register, of 70 per cent. of the electorate, and in a traditional hitherto unbroken Tory seat. All three by-elections since Teheran show a marked weakening of the Government vote, with one seat lost and one nearly lost. This, on the face of it, might appear a singular political situation to follow Teheran. The Government brings back its greatest success in the major strategy of the war; it brings back a firm Allied agreement: it brings back a united strategy for speedy victory; it brings back a sure prospect for post-war international peace and collaboration—and the Government candidates immediately slump in by-elections or even incur defeat. There is evidently here a problem which imperatively requires attention.

IT is true that the situation is not so tragic as such a picture might appear to suggest. There is no division on the main aims of the Government of victory over Fascism. There is no public division on Teheran. The major issues of the war played little part in the campaigning of these by-elections. It is true that it would be a mistake to exaggerate the significance of these by-elections in the peculiar conditions of the electoral truce, with the absence of the normal choice between the major political parties, thus leaving the field open to new contestants. It is also possible to suggest, as has been done, various temporary and proximate causes: the farmers' vote, and dissatisfaction over the plough-up and farm prices; dissatisfaction over post-war policy; the issue of youth versus age, etc. Undoubtedly in the enforced vacuum of the electoral truce a new organisation, without either a past record or responsibility for the future, and able to be all things to all men and to combine a considerable absence of principle with a high moral tone, can temporarily scrape together a very varied medley of dissatisfactions and aspirations. But such analysis is inadequate for the real problem. These by-elections are a symptom of the wider political situation. They are a symptom of widespread dis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

satisfaction with many aspects of the Government's policy and lack of confidence in the Government, despite support of the main aims of victory over Fascism. And they are a symptom of a revolt of the electors against the present method of operation of the electoral truce which, in the name of national unity, appears to disfranchise them and to stereotype the *status quo* of an obsolete Parliament.

THE present Parliament is in its ninth year (exceeding the term of the last war Parliament). The nominal renewal of one quarter of its members through by-elections has been stultified by the method of operation of the electoral truce, devised to freeze the *status quo* of nine years ago. This Parliament of the old Munichite majority, which still gave its vote of confidence to Chamberlain just before Churchill came to power, is not representative of the changed public opinion of today. Not only is the Parliament unrepresentative; but the Government is still composed on the basis of embalming the *status quo* of the balance of parties of nine years ago. The traditional method for the electorate to reinvigorate the Parliament, and thereby also the composition of the Government, is closed to them by the present method of operation of the electoral truce, which is devised to maintain the *status quo* and demands of the electors automatically to return the nominee of the party machine in possession. In consequence, on this basis, the only way in which the electors can express their desire for changes becomes to vote for individuals or organisations outside national unity.

THUS the very mechanism which was devised to maintain national unity becomes in its operation a menace to national unity, and offers a premium to any disruptive forces opposed to national unity. A solution to this problem requires to be found. The Communist Party has proposed during the past two years the method of joint selection conferences, representing the organisations in the constituency supporting national unity, to give the opportunity for a free choice of candidate, within the framework of national unity. This has not been accepted. It may become necessary, in the increasingly acute stage of the problem now reached, to adopt a more drastic solution, and to agree, while maintaining the coalition Government, to by-election contests of representatives of the parties supporting it, so that the electors may have the opportunity, within the framework of national unity, which remains essential for victory, to return the representative of that tendency which they may wish to see strengthened in the national front.

BUT the problem of the political situation is deeper than a question of electoral mechanism. It is at bottom a problem of the response of the Government and of all the political parties to the new situation created by Teheran. It is the problem of a living national unity in the battle against Fascism and for the aims of the peace, in place of the dead hand of a paralysing perpetuation of the *status quo;* of the united mobilisation of the people for the tasks of the offensive and the aims of the peace, with the full, active and distinctive contribution of the parties and organisations supporting these aims and supporting unity in action for these aims. This is above all the question of the activity and leadership of the political labour movement in the present situation, as the representative of the widest mass organisations of the people, with the right and the strength to make their voice felt in the counsels of the Government and to end the existing passivity, which leaves Toryism in practice in undivided control, thereby repelling wide numbers from support of national unity and playing into the hands of the disruptive forces. It

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is this weakness in the present role of the political labour movement which lies at the heart of the problems of the present political situation.

THE whole political situation needs to be reviewed afresh in the light of Teheran, the tasks of the offensive and the winning of the peace. For Teheran is the expression of a deep and basic change in the entire world situation, consequent on the decisive and irrevocable victories of the Red Army over the main Nazi forces, the impending destruction of Fascism and the consolidation of the alliance of the United Nations. Teheran for the first time sets the agreed aim of firm and lasting co-operation of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, not merely for military victory over Fascism, but for the organisation of the world after victory, for reconstruction and the maintenance of peace, and towards the fulfilment of the democratic aspirations of the peoples for "the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance." This perspective of collaboration, if it is realised and maintained, will open a new historical era, which will profoundly affect the future development in every country, and not least in Britain, the pivot and keystone of the new basis of co-operation.

RECENT commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the death of Lenin has called sharply to mind the enormous development which has taken place since then and the profound change in the balance of world forces. In the same month in which Lenin died, the first Labour Government came to office in Britain, which, in accordance with the universal demand of the labour movement and of all progressive opinion, established the first official recognition of the Soviet Government by Britain. This was already a significant change from the early years of the wars of intervention. The strength of the Soviet Union, combined with its mass support throughout the world, had defeated the wars of intervention and compelled this recognition. The uneasy co-existence of capitalism and socialism had begun which was to dominate the next twenty years.

BUT it was an uneasy co-existence, marked by continual strains, crises and breaks, by ceaseless provocation and aggression from the side of reaction. World reaction never abandoned through all these years the dream to destroy Socialism and the Soviet Union. This vicious antagonism poisoned world relations and made possible the growth of Fascism and the revival of German military power. It was recognised that the old methods of the early wars of intervention could no longer be adequate against the daily stronger Soviet Union. A gigantic military machine of brutal suppression, massed mechanical power and limitless aggression had to be created. The new weapon was found in Fascism, superimposed on the old and now revived German military might, which the first world war had been fought to destroy. German Fascism grew to power, to dominate and expand and to threaten all Europe and finally the world, on the basis of the division of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union and through the support of world reaction.

THUS in the name of the "fear of the Bolshevik menace" the most terrible real menace, the most inhuman force humanity has ever had to face, was fostered and allowed to darken the world and extinguish the light of freedom for nation after nation. This central fact of the world situation of the inter-war years, which was ceaselessly stressed at the time in every issue of this journal, has now received official recognition.

> During the twenty years between the last war and this, Germany played upon the fear of Bolshevism to a considerable extent. That was why she was able to get away with murder for so long.
>
> —(R. K. Law, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in January, 1943.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has often been remarked that the survival of German militarism through the catastrophe of 1918 was one of the essential foundations on which Hitler built. But it is less often recalled that the Allies, by their reluctance to tolerate revolutionary movements in Germany in the winter of 1918-19, unwittingly connived at its survival, and that cunning propaganda of "the fear of Bolshevism" was the force which impelled them to this connivance.

(*Times*, editorial, August, 1943.)

Experience has taught a hard lesson; its full conclusions have now to be carried through in action.

BUT the logic of Marxism proved stronger than the logic of Munich. The monster which had been fostered proved a menace, not only to socialism and the Soviet Union, not only to the working-class and intellectuals and Jews, but to the very existence of every nation in the world, and even to the possessions and vested interests of those forces which had fostered the monster. These contradictions wrecked Munich. The success of Munich was able to prevent the alliance of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, which alone could have checked Fascism, and in consequence sacrificed all the nations of Continental Europe to German Fascism. Thus when the assault was finally launched against the Soviet Union, it was the assault of the most formidable military power the world had known, which had been able to overrun France in six weeks, and now backed with all the massed resources of the whole of Continental Europe. But the same logic of history which had led to this outcome led also to the outcome that, when this supreme assault was at last delivered, the world front that was established was not the contemplated world front of Fascism and reaction against Socialism and the Soviet Union, but the world front of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union for the destruction of Fascism. This was the decisive turning-point of June 22, 1941. From this point, the course of world history changed.

THE military alliance of June, 1941, however, was only the beginning, not the end. It was at first still unstable and incomplete in action. It was seen by many as a temporary military expedient, not as a basic change. Influential sections calculated that the resistance of the Soviet Union would prove a useful delaying factor for a few weeks or a few months. Other sections calculated on the mutual destruction of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union as a useful prospect for Britain. Other sections hinted dark prophecies at regular intervals of an impending separate peace of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. Effective fulfilment of the alliance was delayed. Even the Twenty - Year British - Soviet Alliance adopted in 1942, the next great landmark, did not wholly check these currents, and was not yet accompanied by any corresponding long-term alignment of the United States. As the war developed, and the power of resistance and survival of the Soviet Union was demonstrated, and the prospect of the defeat of Fascism drew into view, these same forces began to speak of the menace of Soviet power after the defeat of Fascism, to hold out once again the old "menace of Bolshevism" in Europe, and to indulge in lurid prophecies of "World War III."

TEHERAN has provided the basis for completely defeating these calculations and ensuring a different future for the world. The assault on the Soviet Union by the most formidable offensive military power the world has known is now finally and irrevocably broken. The certainty of the future defeat of Fascism becomes visible to all, whatever the battles that have still to be faced. The question of the future after victory becomes, above all, the question of the relations of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union. This question governs the future of the world. The old course of the twenty years after 1918 can no longer be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repeated. What shall be the new course? With realist understanding the leaders of the Governments of Britain and the United States have recognised the new world relations of power and the responsibility which is laid upon them and have set their course for full and long-term collaboration with the Soviet Union, for a united coalition strategy in the joint winning of the victory, and for full collaboration in the organisation of the world after victory. Thereby a new perspective opens for all peoples.

BUT the fulfilment of this perspective—which is not yet certain, which has still to be fought for—depends on the political situation in Britain and the United States. If a change of political forces in the United States or in Britain were to undermine the foundations of the Teheran policy, then this perspective of harmonious world advance could be destroyed and vanish, and give place to new and deepening crisis, conflict, chaos and misery, through which humanity would have to struggle to its future liberation. Never was the responsibility so great which now rests above all upon the democratic and progressive forces in Britain and the United States. We cannot afford to under-estimate the dangerous forces which are still at work, also after Teheran, to undermine its outcome and reverse its policy.

WHEN President Roosevelt returned to the United States after Teheran, he spoke of "the sense of let-down" which he felt in surveying the internal situation in the United States, the "unseeing moles" at work to disrupt the war effort, the unscrupulous agitation of reaction, and the blindness of wide sections assuming easy victory and concerned only for sectional advantage. With unsparing energy and courageous leadership he lashed out at "the danger of Rightist reaction" and set forth the programme for victory. The vehemence of his address is a measure of the seriousness of the issue which is now being fought in the United States, and of the strength of the opposition forces which have to be overcome. Here the opposition to the basic policies of Teheran is less clamorous and blatant, more subtle in its methods to spread defeatism and distrust. But these dangers exist here also. The experience on the Polish issue is a warning.

THE American Communists, as expressed in the recent speech of Browder, have shown their understanding of the seriousness of the issue and of the fight which has to be fought. The United States is the most powerful centre of world capitalism. Will the United States follow the path of Teheran, of collaboration with the Soviet Union for world democratic advance, or will the forces opposed to Roosevelt conquer and choose a different path? The answer to this question is not only of vital importance for the United States. The answer to this question will be obviously of decisive importance for the whole future world perspective for all peoples, no less than for the future of the people of the United States. With unhesitating clearness the American Communists have recognised their paramount responsibility to throw all their strength into this fight; and they have drawn the necessary conclusions in respect of organisation and immediate policy. In the United States there is no mass political labour movement. The urgent fight over the policy represented by Teheran will be fought and decided within the forms of the two traditional party machines. Any self-isolation from this fight, or presentation of future issues of capitalism or socialism to cut across and disrupt the alignment for Teheran, would play into the hands of reaction.

THE commentators who have endeavoured to discover in this the "end of Communism" in the United States, and even to draw therefrom conclusions for the very different conditions of other

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries (contrast, for example, the present simultaneous almost exactly opposite situation of the Communist Parties of France, Jugoslavia or Czechoslovakia), only reveal once again their failure to understand the principles of Marxism and Leninism, which find their realisation precisely in the response to a concrete situation and ruthless drawing of the practical conclusions for the path of advance. These commentators have failed to notice the significance of the fact that these proposals of the American Communist Party were presented to the public in a mass demonstration to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the death of Lenin, and that the same speech which made the proposals proclaimed anew the guidance of the policy of the American Communists in the light of the teachings of Lenin.

HERE in Britain the conditions of our problem are different, although the same general international perspective represented by Teheran governs equally our tasks and path of advance. In Britain there is a mass political labour movement, which, based on the Trade Unions, constitutes one of the two major governing parties, recognises the aim of Socialism, has twice constituted a government, and aspires to full governmental power in the near future. There is no public division on Teheran; it was a Conservative Prime Minister and a Conservative Foreign Secretary that signed the declarations of Teheran and Moscow; and the aims therein expressed are formally recognised as part of the platform of national unity. This does not mean that the fight for Teheran does not need to be carried through with equal urgency, against many obstacles and cross-currents; but the conditions of the fight are different. Here the main necessity, to ensure the fulfilment of Teheran, and to mobilise the democratic and progressive forces behind Teheran, requires, above all, the strengthening of the role and activity of the labour movement, to play its full part in the Government, in strengthening the Government, in pressing for the necessary policies to fulfil Teheran, and to advance to full leadership of the nation in the tasks immediately following the war. And for the fulfilment of these aims the experience of these recent years has shown that the Communist Party has its indispensable role to play, as the strongest weapon to assist in strengthening the entire labour movement and to fight for the unity of the labour movement.

ALL our efforts need now to be directed, first and foremost, to the fulfilment of the immediate strategic aims of Teheran, for the success of the offensive and for speediest victory over Fascism. But this fight cannot be separated from the political aims of Teheran. The present and the future merge closely together. We need to rouse and mobilise the entire people, to combat every tendency to defeatism and disruption, to strengthen the Government, and to strengthen and win unity of the labour movement, both in order to ensure victory in the coming battles and to go forward to the great changes which must follow victory throughout the world and in Britain.

January 20 R. P. D.

BOUND VOLUMES 1943

Owing to unexpected generosity of readers sending us spare copies in addition to the required 12 for binding, we have been able to bind more copies than was originally thought possible, and there are still a few volumes available at 11s. each, carriage paid. Please send cash with order.

LABOUR MONTHLY 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Teheran Follow-up

by IVOR MONTAGU

TEHERAN (and Moscow) represented the climax of achievement toward which progressive policies had been striving not only throughout the war but for years before. It enshrined the co-operation of Great Britain, U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. in war and peace (the ending of aggression and the maintaining of the peace, because, together, these three powers have the requisite strength).

Co-operation in war, to shorten it (rebuffing the Far Easterners and others more sinister who held out to Hitler the hope of prospects changed for the better, disunity and faintheartedness which a long war must involve); and to mount blows agreed in scope and timing from East, West and South (the Second Front, the deaths of Moore-Brabazonism, the "bombing alone" school, the soft underbelly school, the system of "deciding first" and "informing" U.S.S.R. afterwards, etc.).

Co-operation in peace, to establish the world family of democratic nations, great and small (death-knell of anti-Soviet power combinations, Central European, or enforced western—*a la* Smuts—federations, *cordon militaires*, renunciation of Falange Spain as fit associate and anti-Soviet "Totalitarian" slanders); and to eradicate Fascism and punish the Fascist criminals (death-knell of appeasement, Amgot, Darlanism, etc.).

The agreements did not, of course, mean that these things were *won*, would follow *automatically* in the sequel. But it meant that for the first time they had been agreed. A new epoch had opened. Henceforth the fight for them would be transacted on a new, infinitely more advantageous, basis. They are now the accepted, fully fledged policy of the lands concerned. The campaigners against them are spotlighted as disrupters and sabateurs of national policy and undertakings.

This is how the LABOUR MONTHLY presented the significance of Teheran, and from this analysis it was able to draw the conclusion that henceforth the struggle, the combat of the progressive against the reactionary forces of the world, would be centred around Teheran, the effort on the one hand to realise, on the other to sabotage, it.

History moves swiftly in 1944. The events of the past month have brilliantly justified this picture.

What are the world sequels to Teheran (to Teheran and the continued advances of the Red Army, for the two are intimately linked)?

Directly, a series of immediate steps expressing the agreements arrived at.

First and foremost, the appointment of the commanding team for the Second Front operation, and the associated organisational measures. (The announcement of these appointments, with the B.B.C. candidly making use of the term "Second Front," pouring scorn by implication on the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet agitators of the Kemsley Press and Transport House, with their chatter of "Second," "Third" and "Fourth" fronts in Africa, Italy, the air, the East, or on the sea). Together with this goes the declaration of the appointed chief commander, Eisenhower, of the possibility of victory in 1944 (thus engraving an epitaph on the Quebec long-war prognostications of Bracken and yet more exalted slowcoaches).

The Soviet-Czechoslovak mutual defence Treaty make an R.I.P. on the tombstones of the twin projects of "Eastern Federation," the one visualised as a series of Fascist or subordinate satellites around an Imperial Poland, the second as a batch under reinstated Hapsburg Otto—for Czechoslovakia, not only by its geographic position, but also as chief indus-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial base, was an indispensable adjunct of either combination.

The Soviet declaration on Polish restoration and independence points the logical solution of this problem on the basis of the acknowledgment of rights of nations, "great and small," endorsed at Teheran by the three great participating Allies.

And the Kharkov trial leaves speechless the eager appeasers and whitewashers of Fascism, already preparing to become eloquent on the difficulties of fair trial and proof for war criminals, with its neat, practical demonstration of the actual simplicity of dealing with the matter.

All these concrete strides forward derive from the agreement on the principles concerned attained at Teheran, and have been effected within the space of a few weeks.

Next, as indirect effect, comes the Nazi response. The chill declaration of the certainty of coming destruction, without appeal or offer of compromise, faced the Nazis with the defeat of their dream of political division of the Allies. Never equal to the force of Britain, U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. together, the Nazis' hope can never have been higher than "one-by-one." The defeat of the blitz tactic by the Red Army on the Eastern Front, prevented the purely military and chronological realisation of this sole strategy feasible for Nazi victory. Teheran ended the hope of achieving it by political means, granted the firm maintenance of the Teheran policy. Now it is left with but one course, to play for time in hope to reverse the Teheran policy by a change in the Allied countries.

By stepping up of anti-bomber defence, clinging in the East to each last ditch, hoarding of available reserves against western invasion, consolidation of its grip on the satellite states, calling up of schoolboys on the home front, back-to-the-wall propaganda designed not only to stimulate effort in Germany but to lead to complacency among the Allies—Nazidom tries to gain time in Europe. (A significant reflection of the momentarily-left-in-cold-storage hopes of intermediation is the suddenly franker Germanic grip on Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, etc. The newly intransigeant tone of Kallay, the Finnish dismissal of their "democratic" showpiece Fagerholm, the shooting of the Ciano crew, these are all of a piece.) And at the same time, with concentrated backing of its friends abroad, it strives to undermine the position of the leader it judges weakest-placed—Roosevelt.

The main offensive against Teheran is thus launched on the American continent.

The U.S. Catholic hierarchy openly derogates the Moscow agreements. Hearst and Chicago McCormick denounce the President as deliberately dissipating American strength abroad. Wheeler protests at the arrangements for U.S. troops to share in the invasion of Europe.

The anti-Roosevelt coalition in Congress, composed of the bought men of monopoly-capital, the direct associates of Fascist agents of the Coughlin, Smith, McWilliams type, the feudal poll-taxers from the South, elected by 7 per cent. and less of their adult population—these thwart the war measures of the administration. They refuse adequate taxation, control of war profits, and stabilisation of the cost of living. Their accomplices in the trade union movement—of the type of John Lewis of the Miners, Woll, Hutcheson and Dubinsky of the A.F. of L.—incite disunity and join with big business in demands rendering inflation inevitable, having the common object of creating a gulf between the President's war policies and organised Labour.

At the same time, acting through "Falange and Hispanidad," Hitler's minions find the time ripe to intensify the Fascist network in South America, facing the U.S. administration with the alternative of acquiescence or action liable to be provocatively misrepresented as an aban-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

donment of the "Good Neighbour" policy.

Anti-Nazi propaganda becomes condemned by the U.S. Catholic "Legion of Decency" as "liable to incite personal hatred of the enemy," while unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-British agitation becomes the stock-in-trade of every jackal eager to inherit the old lion's presidial chair at the coming electoral opportunity.

The whole builds up to a secret blackmail from within the Democratic Party, threatening to disrupt the President's election apparatus unless the Teheran schedules are abandoned and the assault on Europe dropped till after election time at the end of 1944.

The anti-Teheranites in Britain are not as yet similarly revealing their hand. Only outcrops of the type of the *Nineteenth Century and after*, the Catholic pro-Fascists of the *Catholic Herald* and the unspeakable parliamentary spokesmen of the 18Bs think the time opportune for frankness.

The enemies of Teheran here concentrate on holding as many vantage positions as they can for recoil at a riper moment. They fight a fierce rearguard action over Amgot, postponing as long as possible, and with an ill grace, acquiescence in the democratic rules of the Moscow Conference relayed through the Advisory Council. Whispering around the alleged verdict of a British diplomat at the Vatican to the effect that "the idea of democracy in Italy is nonsense, Italy will have to be ruled by some form of Fascism or other," they cherish Fascists in the administration and Italy goes from hunger to typhus beneath their agents' rule (to Goebbels' delight).

Excuses and lies are offered to make believe that Franco has withdrawn his troops from the German army, as once before the same persons invented the same tales to pretend the Germans had withdrawn from his.

Centring in Ankara, the apostles of the Royal Yugoslav and Greek Governments (somewhat shop-soiled) transfer their energies to hastily finding in the decadent rake Cyril, the self-indulgent plump brat Michael and the Rumanian peasant leader Maniu ("He was only in favour of war against Russia up to the Dniester") new heroes to hold off Red invasion from the Balkans.

And, cardinal triumph, they brew a bitter witches' broth in France, prolonging the policy of starving the resistance movement of arms, thus multiplying the casualties of Allied troops to a countless degree in the immediate future and storing up a legacy of bitter feelings from the French in the succeeding years.

Significantly, Morrison's apologia for the Mosley release, Grigg's slanders on the *Daily Worker* journalists, represent a new concerted endeavour by authorities to split the progressive forces before the crucial fight for a post-war people's Britain in a democratic world. Never yet in the history of all lands—from the Axis pact to the latest Argentine "reforms"—has "anti-Communism" ever been anything but a prelude to reactionary violence and betrayal.

The instruments to counter all these gangsters are in our hands. Teheran is the monster-slaying Excalibur. But not yet, alas, do all the progressive forces realise fully their danger, their opportunity and the force in intensification of effort that must yet be paid to avert the one and win the future from the other.

Yet now is the greatest hour in the downtrodden's long fight for freedom. The power of the three greatest States is pledged to the action that opens for mankind the biggest chance it has ever had, the path is marked. But the fruit will not roll into our laps, the tree must still be climbed.

INDEX FOR 1943.—The index for 1943 will be sent free of charge to any reader sending a stamped, addressed foolscap envelope.

LABOUR MONTHLY **134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The U.S.A. and Teheran

by FRANK PITCAIRN

EIGHTY-NINE million tons, somewhere around two-thirds of the estimated world output, was the figure of United States steel ingot production in 1943. A gigantic item among those making up the total weight of the U.S.A. in the world war and the world's peace. It was, nevertheless, just six million tons short of the year's production schedule. That, in turn, was in a sense a conservative schedule, since it was based on capacity as at present organised—which is to say as at present under-organised. It was at the moment when these typical figures of the steel industry were made public that President Roosevelt returned from Teheran and sent to Congress his historic message calling for total mobilisation of the money, manpower and resources of the United States in the prosecution of victorious war.

It was a Message to Congress which in every sense could be described as—was indeed clearly and challengingly intended to be described as—a consequence of Teheran. This was democratic America's first step towards implementation of the Teheran policy and all that it implies. There was nothing accidental in the fact that this Message, with its demands upon the present and its programme for the future, should have contained too the most vigorous attack upon the "Right Reactionaries," the "pests" of Washington, made by President Roosevelt at any time during his present Presidential term. It was a statement which made clear to all the world both the path which democratic America desires to follow, and the nature of the enemies which will try to prevent it so doing.

In a statement immediately after delivery of the Message, Vice-President Wallace dotted some i's and crossed some t's. He roundly declared that there were in the United States enormously powerful financial interests which positively did not desire to see a peaceful and orderly development of the post-war world. He suggested that perhaps this could be connected with their desire to pick up, somewhere near the point whereat they had been forced to drop them, their lucrative associations and connections with the great German world concerns whose aggressive imperialism begot Adolf Hitler.

That such interests exist in the United States is one of those facts which everyone has been taking as a matter of course for years, but the consequences of which people have been slow or reluctant to draw.

Vice-President Wallace has denounced them many times before. But against the background of Teheran and of the programme subsequently announced by the President, the Vice-President's latest statement has a somewhat novel and specific significance: it amounts to a declaration that if the policy of Teheran is to be carried out successfully by that nation without which it cannot be carried out at all—a nation with, among other great things, a steel production of 89,000,000 ingots per annum—the enemies of the policy have to be not merely recognised but defeated. They must be defeated by a rallying of the American people around a programme broad enough to unite and progressive enough to inspire.

It is, in fact, such a programme which is outlined in the Presidential Message. In Britain, for obvious reasons, it was probably the proposal for a National Service Law which attracted principal attention. But it would be wrong either to dissociate the National Service proposal from the proposals for action against profiteering, in favour of price control and for the increase of taxation, or to suppose that in the immediate mobilisation of the United States for victory the one proposal is any more "drastic" than the others, any

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more essential than them, or indeed, as a matter of practical politics, possible without them.

These were facts explicitly recognised by the President himself. With admirable realism he linked all these proposals indisseverably together, while at the same time outlining separately those principles of a "new Bill of Rights" which are now to be seen as an integral part of his general objectives, without being scheduled at this moment as a part of the immediate essential programme for the winning of the war.

There have been people who supposed that in some sense the President's "win the war" policy was not merely a "moving on and away from" the New Deal, but could be seen as a repudiation of the New Deal, a tracking back to methods and principles which the New Deal had been designed to challenge. The misconception now exposed by the latest proclamation of Presidential policy is fundamental —and it is one which is to be met with in much speculation about many other political situations besides that of the United States. It arises from a misunderstanding of, or failure to realise fully, the social implications of the world struggle against Hitlerism, the implications for the future of the world of the co-operation of the United Nations and more particularly of Britain and the United States with the U.S.S.R.

It is, in reality, entirely logical that the most "progressive" statement of American policy, the statement most violently challenging to the Right Reactionaries, should be made as the immediate result of the Teheran decisions and in the form of a Message calling upon the American people for a war effort greater than any they had yet imagined.

President Roosevelt described as disastrous the consequences of any attempt to reach, after this war, the notorious "normalcy" of the 1920s. That was a period when reaction triumphed on the home front and the world front; a period, particularly, during which, under the pretence of "saving America from revolution," "protecting individual enterprise," "defeating the Red Menace," the blackest of near-Fascist reactionaries conducted in the United States themselves a series of the most brutal attacks upon elementary democratic rights, and in Europe and Asia threw the huge weight of American money, American supplies (including American food) into a bitter and ruthless battle against the popular forces of the nations seeking to struggle out of the morass of war onto new high ground.

It may be that there are those in Britain who still under-estimate what a new triumph of similar forces in the United States would mean for the world now and in the future. It is unlikely that the peoples of Central Europe—remembering the late teens and early twenties of this century—make the same mistake. It is not insignificant that precisely the Nazis and their associates (themselves the closest political allies of the extreme American reactionaries) cynically employ in their propaganda in Europe just that threat of the consequences of a triumphant American reaction as a means of spreading alarm and despondency among the peoples of occupied Europe and of discouraging enthusiasm for allied victory.

No one can look back over the past years of American policy without appreciating the reality of the threat to the war effort and the peace effort represented by the American reactionaries. What have they done? Their great Trusts for their own profit and in defence of their monopoly positions gave aid and comfort to the Fascist Trusts and withheld vital patents and facilities from the Allies. In the trade union movement the reactionaries conducted violent campaigns against world trade union unity and in particular against the Soviet Trade Unions. At every point these people—whether they were Wall Street barons or were masquerading as Labour leaders—did their best to injure and delay the cause of unity between the United Nations. In the most recent phase

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they have spectacularly rallied to the support of the Polish *emigre* imperialists, who in their turn characteristically and correctly see in the Right Wing of American political life their last hope of averting in their own country and throughout Eastern Europe the opening of that "Century of the Common Man" of which Vice-President Wallace has spoken.

To imagine that the defeat of these elements—a defeat essential alike for the prosecution of the war now and the success of later peacemaking—is going to be an easy matter is as naive as to imagine that the outcome of the struggle is one which does not intimately concern the peoples of the other United Nations.

The first outstanding fact of recent American developments is that they have been openly challenged by President Roosevelt on a programme which openly calls upon the mass of the American people to engage now to the utmost in the struggle to implement in war and peace the policy of Teheran.

The second outstanding fact is that the leadership of the American Communist Party, with all its authority in wide sections of the trade union movement, with its paper, the *Daily Worker*, now set for a tenfold increase in readership, has taken steps which ensure that its full resources and energy will be applied in the most practical and effective form to meeting the urgent demands of the situation as it is.

The speech of Earl Browder in New York, analysing and showing the way forward in the new situation, is in a very exact sense the complement to the speeches of the President and of the Vice-President following Teheran. In an atmosphere befouled by the intrigues of people who, in the guise of "progressives" or even, save the mark, of "revolutionaries," would like nothing better than to recreate now just those conditions of the early 1920s against which Roosevelt gave his warning, the speech is a breath of fresh air. This is shown in the realism of its recognition of the dangers represented by the reactionaries, of the need and the possibility of progressive democratic action, and of the perspectives that can be opened by effective American action along the lines of Teheran.

The War Worker and the Second Front

by J. R. CAMPBELL

THE opening of the Second Front in the West in the course of the next few weeks is likely to make exceptional demands on Britain's war-workers. What will be the character of these demands and how can they best be met?

There may be need, over certain areas of the country, for a high level of discipline and fortitude. For those areas will be in the battle zone. The Germans are not only going to take it. They are going to give it. It is now an accepted fact that they have been reserving quite a lot of their aircraft in preparation for beating off invasion attempts. They are likely to try and impede troop movements in this country by attacking the great centres of population lying closest to the points from which the invasion troops embark. For the Germans "bombing the enemies' lines of communication" will mean bombing large areas of Britain. Millions of Britain's workers will be in the danger zone, as they were throughout the 1940-41 blitz. This will itself give the lie to those reactionaries who up till recently were declaring that the industrial workers who were supporting the Second Front would not be called upon to brave its dangers.

Clearly the workers are not in the confidence of the military experts and cannot fix a date for a production drive to coincide with the opening of the Second Front. But the shop stewards and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers' side of the production committees can approach the management with the proposition that in view of the early opening of the Second Front the firm should organise a production month in the near future. Past experience has shown that production months were robbed of their full value because of a shortage of supplies of essential materials and components, manufactured by firms outside the one in which the production drive was being organised. If a production month is fixed for some weeks ahead arrangements can be made for increased supplies from outside, so that full value is obtained for the extra effort.

To cold-shoulder the production enthusiasm of the workers in the early stages of the Second Front would be a colossal mistake on the part of Governments and managements. The first phase of the Second Front will mean a period of almost unbelievable tension for the people of this country. The war will be at their doors in a way that it has not been since the difficult days of May and June, 1940. They will want to play a glorious part in the great struggle taking place on the other side of the Channel. The Government and the managements must recognise the great value of this desire, and give it full expression in well-organised production efforts.

Leading shop stewards on the Clyde have suggested that the employers and Trade Unions should meet to settle outstanding grievances before the Second Front is opened. This is particularly necessary in the shipyards, where the grievances of the black squads are accumulating to a dangerous extent.

The chief dangers to the smooth functioning of other sections of war industry in the difficult period that lies ahead will come from those employers who are intent on wiping out the wartime gains of the workers at the earliest possible moment. Chief centre of danger at the time of writing is the mining industry.

The South Wales colliery managers have with difficulty been persuaded not to operate their threat to withdraw from the Production Committees. No one doubts that certain managers whose principal method of securing labour discipline in pre-war years was the brutal and indiscriminate use of the "sack," are encountering difficulties in a period when they can no longer employ their favourite weapon. All the more reason why they should seek, in co-operation with the Unions, to devise new methods of discipline, but this discipline problem does not justify an overbearing reactionary threat to wreck an essential part of the machinery of coal control—the Pit Production Committees.

We hope that the National Wages Board will, by the time this is in print, have had the sense to ease relations in this industry by granting a substantial increase in wages. The British people, through the young men whom it has called up for the Forces, has declared its emphatic opinion that the mining industry is dirty, dangerous and underpaid. Those young men have been prepared to face all the risks of death and mutilation in the fighting services rather than work in the mining industry. There could be no more deadly condemnation. For this reason it is to be hoped that the National Wages Board will give an increase of wages with a good grace and enable the mining industry to make a glorious new start in this year of victory.

For the rest of war industry, it is essential to liquidate the campaign of victimisation of leading shop stewards that is being engaged in at this moment by reactionary managements in various parts of this country.

High water mark of this campaign is the dismissal of the shop stewards' convenor in Desoutter Rollers for posting on the shop notice board official Trade Union letters telling the workers not to strike and of the convenor of Lincoln Cars (a Ford subsidiary) for holding a canteen meeting to protest against the release of Sir Oswald Mosley. These are outstandingly outrageous examples, but there is sufficient evidence that there is a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

widespread tendency on the part of managements to seize every possible opportunity to dismiss shop stewards.

Allied to this is the continued refusal of some managements to recognise the Trade Unions. The great Ford combine, which was one of the last firms in the U.S.A. to recognise Trade Unions, is still refusing to do so in this country. A great wave of anger is surging up against these firms because the workers see the kinship between Fascists who seek to liquidate the trade union movement and great combines which refuse to recognise it.

These firms take a mean advantage of the workert' patriotism. They know that the workers will hesitate to strike for Trade Union recognition and they therefore consider themselves safe in refusing it. Is it not a scandal that at the moment that thousands of trade unionists are called to lay down their lives in defence of democracy, that great combines are denying to their employees the right to Trade Union protection? These firms are playing a very dangerous game and the sooner the Government forces these anti-Union combines into line with the great majority of employers in this country the better it will be for industrial morale generally.

The Shop Stewards' National Council, understanding that the movement for a settlement of outstanding grievances and for a fresh productive effort must be organised on a national scale, has organised a conference for March 12. Most of the major war factories in Britain are likely to be represented at this conference, which, while not moving outside the orbit of official union policy, will give a new stimulus to production throughout the whole of British war industry. Thus the workers prepare to make their powerful contribution to the Second Front.

The Government in this period of heavy sacrifice has its own independent contribution to make. It has got into bad odour with large sections of our people because of its shilly-shallying in regard to the passage of long-promised social reforms. The great offensive in Europe must be accompanied by a powerful drive on the part of the Government to put those reforms on the statute book. Particular attention will be paid by the armed forces to the Reinstatement Bill now on its way through Parliament. The intention of the bill is good, but its actual machinery contains a number of loopholes for unscrupulous employers who seek to evade their obligations to their former employees. Parliament will render an essential service if it amends the Bill in such a way as to make evasion impossible.

As successes on the Western Front accumulate post-war hopes and fears will grow amongst the workers. Already in the United States President Roosevelt is beginning to outline his policy for demobilisation. The British Government must do likewise. Foremost amongst the demobilisation problems is the question of payment to demobilised soldiers who are either awaiting employment at their old jobs (or their old jobs not being good enough) are seeking to adventure into a new occupation. No suggestion of unemployed benefit (even on a higher scale than at present) is likely to be tolerated by the British people. Demobilisation benefit at the level of an average wage or the payment for a specified period of the wages reigning in the worker's previous employment appear to be the only acceptable alternatives.

Other aspects of the Government's policy for the transition to peace conditions should include:—

An expressed determination to take all possible measures to maintain a high level of employment immediately after the war, so that the demobilisation and reinstatement policy can be made really effective.

Government spokesmen are fond of predicting that there will be no immediate problem. So many houses and such a volume of consumers' goods will be required as will provide immediate employ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment for everyone. It may be so. But it is essential for the Government to have schemes for stimulating employment ready lest this optimistic prophecy is found to be unjustified.

The safeguarding of wage rates at moment when there is a vast movement of labour between the various industries will have to be undertaken by the Government. The wages and conditions obtained during the war must be safeguarded as a minimum. The guaranteed week, in particular, should be made permanent in the industries whete it now operates.

Every worker should be entitled to the protection of a Trade Union and all employers should be forced to recognise the Unions and their shop organisation.

The British working-class has many great wartime achievements to its credit. But its greatest achievements have still to come. That is why we are justified in asking the Government to remove all obstacles to the victory production drive in the pits and factories of Britain.

Corsica and the Liberation of France

by CLEMENS DUTT

ALGIERS. Saturday, January 15.

CORSICA is the first department or county of France itself which has been liberated from the Nazi yoke. For this reason alone the lessons of this experience and the course of events following its liberation are of great importance, both for the light thrown upon problems involved in the liberation of France as a whole and on the historical rebirth of democracy in Europe which is the concern of all.

National Front in Corsica.

The Corsicans are a proud, independent people bound by close ties to the democratic French Republic. When in November, 1942, Hitler invaded the unoccupied zone of France and Italians, with German help, occupied Corsica, the already seething anti-Vichy feeling of the people led to the formation of numerous small resistance groups. The main difficulty lay in a lack of organisation and of a sense of discipline, due to the smallness of the working-class.

Of former political parties only the Communist Party survived; and though few in numbers, less than two hundred, the Communist Party continued propaganda for patriotic unity and began to spread understanding of the need for a single unified illegal organisation, and took the lead in building it. This was the beginning of the National Front, the organisation embracing all patriots with the following as its aims: to expel the invader, liquidate the Vichy regime and re-establish a freely chosen Republican Government.

A mass organisation was gradually built. Each village had its own little group. An illegal paper, *Le Patriote*, with 5,000 copies, pamphlets and leaflets, collection of food and materials for underground fighters and the help of illegal radio and the B.B.C. all played their part in strengthening the National Front.

The National Front rejected equally a passive waiting policy and counsels of premature revolt. It recognised that the development of an organised mass struggle depended on its members gaining experience in immediate action, waged by combat groups. Despite inevitable losses, this correct course brought about a general realisation that such limited mass action is an essential factor in preparing liberation.

A military mission from Algiers quickly reached the conclusion that the National Front organisation was the only one that could effectively assist a landing and so undertook the despatch of arms to it. Nevertheless at the beginning, in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

September of last year, the forces of the National Front were still numerically inferior to those of the enemy. It had a few thousands of armed patriots against 80,000 Italians, 11,000 Germans, with 110 tanks. But on Italy's unconditional surrender on September 8 the Italians were thrown into confusion and the Germans began withdrawing to the northern tip of the island. The National Front leaders realised that the time had come to strike without hesitation. At once, on the night of September 8, the call for a general insurrection was issued, and was obeyed throughout the country.

Help had been promised from Algiers, but not until September 11 did the first ninety-seven men of a battalion sent by General Giraud arrive by submarine, followed later by the rest of 500 men. Thus the actual liberation was carried out by thousands of Franc-tireurs and partisans, who carried out many heroic actions, aided by the small force sent by Giraud.

Why were the Corsican patriots successful? Giovoni, one of the National Front leaders and delegate to the Consultative Assembly at Algiers, states that the liberation of Corsica was essentially the work of the Corsicans themselves and that this success was due to (1) training in struggle; (2) unified leadership through the National Front; (3) partial arming from outside; (4) rapid decision for insurrection and discipline in action.

Corsica After Liberation.

Corsican liberation adds a glorious classic page to the history of popular national insurrection. The first legal issue of *Le Patriote*, dated September 10, printed a stirring manifesto—the call to break with Vichy, rally to free France and take up arms against the invader. The first proclamation was also printed of the revolutionary Prefect Pelletier and the Council of five National Front members reflecting decisive initiative of the victorious people. It states (1) Corsica rallies to the French National Liberation Committee; (2) National Front combat groups are alone recognised as auxiliary police forces; (3) all traitor and Vichy collaborationist organisations are dissolved and their property confiscated; (4) unworthy municipal councillors are dismissed to be replaced by patriots freely elected by men *and women;* (5) Control established over all newspapers; (6) normal work to continue, food hoarding and speculation to be punished.

Corsicans throughout the island rallied to the National Front. A meeting of 1,000 National Front delegates on September 28 heard a report by Giovoni back from Algiers, congratulated the committee of the department which issued the original call to arms and declared its support for programme of a rapid purge, help for victims of the struggle, a rise of wages and measures against the Black Market. It declared against the return to superseded legal forms of 1875 and affirmed "legal is that which the people demands and imposes."

Very quickly after the liberation, however, attempts developed to contest the authority of the National Front in regulating the problems of liberated Corsica. After only a few days Prefect Luizon, nominated by the Algiers National Committee, took over the direction of a department in insurrection and was added to the department National Front Committee on instigation from Algiers. Under the influence of Giacobbi an attempt was made to organise a counterpoise to the National Front in the form of an organisation called *The Fourth Republic* and then France Combattante. But these were rejected in Corsica.

The Vichy members of village councils and town councils were thrown out, but it seems that control from Algiers has in many cases denied the validity of the new elections of departmental delegates from patriotic municipalities. The Corsicans wanted a new *Conseil-General of Department* freely elected by the people; but, apparently on a decision from Algiers, it has been constituted of twelve members nominated by the central

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government. The view was apparently held in some quarters that the National Front was good enough for fighting invaders but that its members were not sufficiently experienced for administrators.

On the other hand, with the affairs of the Department returning to central control from Algiers, the economic and administrative situation has evoked much dissatisfaction. After four months the Black Market continues, food difficulties are acute, transport and road repairs remain disorganised and elimination of sabotaging elements especially in powerful positions has hardly gone forward. Pourtalet, a farmer, Communist Party Deputy and Vice-President of the National Defence Commission of the Consultative Assembly, after returning from an official visit to Corsica at the end of December, said that the situation there really shows no advance on that of the time of liberation. In addition, it was decided a month ago that Corsicans should surrender their arms on the ground that these were needed to help France. This has encountered stubborn opposition, an opposition natural enough —for the people are accustomed to carry arms—and there are still Fascist elements undisarmed, while Corsica is near enough to the theatre of war for possible parachute raids or other forms of attack. Corsica, moreover, is the advanced bastion of Free France, and needs its Home Guard as much as Britain.

Despite all difficulties, the National Front continues to grow and has now over 30,000 members. It has a women's organisation with over 5,000 members. Trade Unions in Corsica have resumed active functioning. The Communist Party has about 6,000 members.

Liberation of France.

From what has been said it may seem that Corsican experience provides both encouragement and warning. The conditions for the liberation of the rest of France differ in many respects from those of Corsica; but two main conclusions can be drawn which are all the more important because of the differences.

The first is the reinforcement of the general truth that liberation must essentially be the work of people themselves, that it depends above all on popular initiative. Freedom cannot be established passively from outside. In Corsica there was fortunately a unified mass movement from the start. In France for various reasons this has been delayed, although there have been many splendid exploits of French patriots. Despite De Gaulle's statement that passivity is the worst crime, an attitude of passive expectation characterises some circles outside France more than inside and hampers the growth of real spirit of war and encouragement of popular guerilla warfare.

The growth of the French resistance movement testifies to the readiness of the French people to take the path of mass struggle for liberation. Largely under the influence of resistance delegates from France more attention is now being paid by France's provisional Government to the needs of the French struggle. But more recognition is required, both from it and from the Allies, of the mass popular character which this struggle is bound to assume. Hesitation in supplying arms and material for French patriots is in itself partly a political reflection of the distrust of mass action.

Failure to understand that war against Fascism must be a war of the people and not only of the army has been responsible for many setbacks. When General Tassigny raised the standard of revolt against the Germans in 1942 he failed primarily because he relied solely on a few skeleton army divisions instead of heading a popular rising. André Marty, French Communist leader, in an article (which for some curious reason came under the Algiers censorship ban) has pointed out that if Tassigny had sought the co-operation of the Montpelier National Front Committee he could have obtained the support of thousands of workers and peasants in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action which would have made possible the maintenance of a bridgehead until allied help arrived.

In the liberation of North Africa from the Vichy regime a similar lack of reliance on the people was responsible for great obstruction and delay in the establishment of a democratic regime, the effects of which are not yet overcome. The five hundred patriots who staked their lives to assure the Allied landing had not built any mass organisation. They did not even effect the release of imprisoned deputies.

Hence the basic principle is that well expressed in the recent illegal issue of *Humanité* (Number 237); "The initiative of the people is always at critical hours of history an essential element of victory. It is because we have confidence in the people of France and their creative genius that our Party, which is proud of having done its utmost for the formation of a powerful movement for the independence of France, proposed that committees of fighting France should be formed everywhere. The adoption of this proposal by all resistance groups can and must greatly facilitate the accomplishment of the tasks involved in national insurrection."

The second conclusion which follows from the Corsican experience is the necessity of ensuring full scope for popular initiative in the establishment of free institutions after liberation. The liberation of France, even more than that of Corsica, will also require military intervention from outside. But it would be disastrous if considerations of military expediency or even distrust in the people themselves were to lead to a denial of popular initiative in the revolutionary task of reconstruction that is required.

A continuation of the sorry *AMGOT* story, or even such a compromise as poisoned the atmosphere in North Africa, is almost unthinkable. But a successful national insurrection in France will bring new popular representatives to the fore and this is bound to provoke opposition from groups which desire a return to the policy of sectional interests which events have rendered out-of-date. Algiers, with its remoteness from the theatre of war, and with a certain absence of war atmosphere that even resembles the "phony war" period, is not characteristic of the French war spirit. This deadening atmosphere has apparently also retarded the solution of the problems of liberated Corsica.

But the Liberation Committee now exiled in Algiers feels itself sufficiently representative of France in its struggle to act as provisional Government until a new constitution be adopted. It has every ground for exercising such authority. But paper schemes for a democratic constitution of a new French Republic are not enough. National Liberation is not a mere matter of voting. Millions of people will be swept into active movement. More confidence in the people and in the mass National Front organisation needs shown than was seen in the case of Corsica. In Britain also our duty is to see that obstacles are not placed in the way of democratic victory and of solidarity with the French people. Only the unity of the popular struggle can provide a sure basis for the world family of democratic nations after the end of the war.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s. Two weeks' notice is required for change of address.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Trade Union Unity

(*The following article under the title "Two Trade Union Congresses," was published in the Trade Union magazine* War and the Working Class. —Ed. L.M.)

DURING the time the second world war has been in progress the degree of activity and organisation of the working-class in the United States has increased considerably. The working-class is undoubtedly playing a big part in the war effort of the United States. That part, however, could be considerably greater if the labour movement were not split up and divided as it is today.

The Trade Unions of the United States still suffer from lack of unity. There are two big and influential trade union bodies: The American Federation of Labour and the Congress of Industrial Organisation.

According to the Report presented by the A.F. of L. to the National Convention in Boston last October, the membesrhip of the Federation at that time numbered 6,000,000. Among the larger Unions affiliated to the A.F. of L. are the Local Transport Workers, the Carpenters and Joiners of America the Ladies' Garment Workers of America, the Electrical Workers of America, the Hod Carriers, Building and Common Labourers of America and the International Association of Machine-Builders. There has been a considerable increase in the past three years in the membership of the Munition Workers' Union, the Aircraft, Shipbuilding and Engineering Workers' Union and also of the Builders and Electrical Workers' Unions.

Still more striking is the increase in the size of the Congress of Industrial Organisation, which has in a relatively short time developed into an important trade union body and at present also numbers about 6,000,000 members. A point of particular note is that the C.I.O. has tackled energetically the job of organising the unorganised workers. It has won a firm footing in such major American industries as automobiles, aircraft and electrical and radio equipment production, steel, shipbuilding, rubber, and so on. Among the Unions affiliated to the C.I.O. are the United Automobile and Aircraft Workers of America, with a membership of 1,175,000; the Mine, Mills and Smelting Workers with over 600,000 workers; the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America with 500,000; the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America with 375,000; the Textile Workers' Union of America with 360,000 members.

There are several dozen million workers and office employees in America today, but out of this total only a little over 12,000,000 are organised. And it will readily be understood that unity in the American trade union movement could be a big factor in drawing in millions of new members, and could greatly increase the role and weight of the Trade Unions in the country's political and economic life. The recent National Conventions of the A.F. of L. in Boston and of the C.I.O. in Philadelphia gave some idea of the degree of organisation and strength of the American Trade Unions, and also of the political ideas of their leaders, and the latters' stand in the matter of national and international trade union unity.

The A.F. of L. Convention showed that the tone of the A.F. of L. is still set by the more reactionary sections of its leadership, that is, by Matthew Woll, the Vice-president of the Federation; Hutcheson, the President of the Carpenters and Joiners of America; Ryan, the President of the Longshoremen's Association; and Dubinsky, President of the Ladies' Garment Workers Union; and that these are vigorously resisting national trade union unity, while claiming that it is the C.I.O. which interferes with it.

Both before and after the Convention the more reactionary leaders of the A.F. of L. campaigned against agreement with the C.I.O. At the same time Woll,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hutcheson and the rest launched a big campaign for the readmission to the A.F. of L. of the United Mineworkers of America, with its pro-Fascist leader, John Lewis, a notorious opponent of unity. This was to strengthen their position and to frustrate the efforts of the advocates of national trade union unity, to establish closer relations with the C.I.O. In this matter of Lewis's admission, the reactionary leadership of the A.F. of L. was actively supported at the Boston Convention by Martel, the A.F. of L. leader of Detroit, who did his best to prove that the admission of Lewis would weaken the C.I.O. in Detroit and strengthen the A.F. of L. The admission of Lewis was opposed by Lazzari, a Pittsburgh delegate, who said that it would strengthen the influence of the local Fascists, the defeatists of the America First Committee and of other enemies of the working-class. Fletcher, Vice-president of the Seattle Building Workers' Union, spoke along the same lines.

The A.F. of L. Convention passed a resolution directed against national trade union unity and against the affiliation of the C.I.O. and the Railway Brotherhood to the Joint Committee of the A.F. of L. and the British Trades Union Congress. What is more, the resolution demanded outright that the British Trades Union Congress should not take up the matter independently with the C.I.O. and the Railway Brotherhood.

The reactionary leadership of the A.F. of L. took advantage of the Convention to make an open and even ostentatious political demonstration against closer relations and co-operation with the Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. To this end the International Contact Committee of the A.F. of L. went out of its way to express its deep gratitude to Nagler, the A.F. of L. delegate at the last British Trades Union Conference for what it called his "splendid services" on that occasion. What Nagler had done at the Conference was to attack the Soviet Trade Unions. His sally was clearly intended to prevent the development of closer relations and mutual understanding between the Trade Unions of Britain and the U.S.S.R. and was to give the cue for an all-round drive by the reactionary wing in the A.F. of L.

Actually both Nagler and the other A.F. of L. reactionaries meant it as a political sally not only against the Soviet Trade Unions, but on the Soviet Union itself, a country that is the Ally of the United States and is fighting a righteous war of liberation against Hitler Germany, the common enemy. This hostile sally against the Soviet Trade Unions on the part of the A.F. of L. reactionaries was seconded by an open and vicious anti-Soviet campaign in a number of A.F. of L. publications. The chief argument of the A.F. of L. reactionary clique is the same old slanderous assertions that relations with the Soviet Trade Unions would accentuate existing ideological differences and aggravate disunity in the American labour movement.

Naturally, the reactionary leaders have all along had to shift and manoeuvre out of regard for the sentiments of the masses of the A.F. of L. membership; but they have pursued their anti-Soviet campaign by hypocritical outward expressions of admiration for the Red Army and the Soviet people.

We cannot pass over the fact that William Green, the President of the A.F. of L., who is a member of the Committee of American-Soviet Friendship, did nothing about the actions of Matthew Woll, Hutcheson, Dubinsky and the rest of the isolationists and definitely anti-Soviet group, whose political manoeuvres in effect strike at the vital interests of the United States and the whole of the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

As Nagler, Woll and the other anti-Soviet elements attacked the Soviet Trade Unions ostensibly in defence of Trade Union democracy, one should mention that the leadership of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, to which Nagler belonged, would not allow

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his conduct at the British Trades Union Conference to be discussed by the Trade Union branches. Alex. Shepherd took up this point on behalf of the union rank and file. He asked whether it was not strange that while their representatives in London were giving lessons in democracy to prominent members of the Soviet Trade Unions, the members of their own Union did not have the opportunity to discuss, adopt measures or express their opinions, regarding the position taken by Nagler at the Trades Union Congress. What trade union democracy in the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union under Dubinsky looks like in reality is also evident from the decision passed by the Executive asking for the expulsion of Arnold Ames, the Chairman of the Union's Committee of American-Soviet Friendship. His offence was that he sent to the British Trade Unions a letter signed by 3,000 Union members protesting emphatically against what Nagler had said. Similarly, the reactionary nature of the A.F. of L. leadership is clear from the fact that the Boston Convention adopted a resolution approving the actions of the notorious Dies Commission, ostensibly formed to investigate the activities of persons of alien descent, but actually directed against progressive individuals and organisations.

The progressive wing of the A.F. of L. has been working ever more actively in opposition to the A.F. of L. reactionaries, for unity in the national and international trade union movement. At the Boston Convention this progressive wing was poorly represented. However, the increased influence of the progressive elements was indicated by the action taken by the New York Federation of Labour Committee, advocates of trade union unity, and also by resolutions which A.F. of L. Trade Unions had passed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Connecticut, Vermont, Wisconsin and other States. Many local branches have pronounced themselves in favour of a co-operation agreement with the C.I.O. of a joint political campaign in the elections, and similar measures.

As compared with the A.F. of L. Convention, that of the National C.I.O. held in Philadelphia only last November, was distinctly progressive. In its endeavours to establish unity among the American Trade Unions without further delay, the C.I.O. continues to insist on joint action with the A.F. of L. and the Railway Brotherhood. Philip Murray, the President of the C.I.O., in one of his speeches, urged the C.I.O. Unions to fight for joint A.F. of L., C.I.O. and Railway Brotherhood local committees, for concerted action in all matters affecting the vital interests of the working-class. And this position of the C.I.O. is meeting with ever readier response among the American Trade Union membership. A Labour Victory Committee of representatives of the A.F. of L., the C.I.O. and the Railway Brotherhood has been formed in Arizona, and the workers in other parts of the country are beginning to follow suit.

The C.I.Os.' proposal for a joint political campaign in connection with the forthcoming Presidential elections is also dictated by the desire for closer relations between the various trade union bodies. The resolutions of the National Congress of Industrial Organisation, and of the Conventions of Trade Unions affiliated to it, the United Automobile and Aircraft Workers of America, the United Rubber Workers of America, the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, the United Electrical, Radio and *Machine Workers of America*, the National Maritime Union and certain others, are directed against Lewis's attempt to disrupt and undermine the American labour movement.

Coupled with the C.I.Os.' struggle for national trade union unity is an equally vigorous struggle for trade union unity on an international scale. Reporting to the Philadelphia Congress, the President of the C.I.O., Philip Murray, said:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The time has arrived to depart from mere pious expressions concerning international labour unity. The moment for action is here. We must accomplish international labour unity now as the imperative need for the most effective prosecution of the people's war and the defeat of Hitler.

And the resolution unanimously adopted at the Congress read:—

In this struggle for national survival the C.I.O. believes that our basic principles can be protected and assured only through international labour collaboration. This is an immediate, imperative need towards unity of labour, the governments and peoples of the United Nations to achieve the most effective prosecution of the war against the Axis, and for the establishment of the four freedoms in peace. For the effective achievement of the desires and aspirations of the rank and file membership, international labour unity must embrace the labour movements of all the United Nations on the basis of appropriate representation without discrimination.

Resolutions in the same strain were passed by the Conventions of a number of the more influential C.I.O. unions. Speaking at the Convention of the National Maritime Union, Joseph Curran, President of the Union, declared that not a single nation had done more for the liberation of the whole world from Fascism than the Soviet Union. The United States Government, Curran went on to say, collaborates with the Soviet Union for the mutual benefit of both sides. Therefore, the international solidarity of the trade unions, including the Soviet Union's Trade Unions was, he said, possible and essential.

The Convention expressed its unanimous approval of the decisions reached at the Moscow Conference of the Three Foreign Secretaries of the Allied Nations.

We recognise our great responsibility in supporting the decisions of the Moscow Conference, which aims at the speediest ending of the war and the continuation of the present close collaboration in the conduct of the war into the period following the end of hostilities, so that peace can be maintained and political, economic and social welfare of the peoples be fully promoted.

The Convention also voiced unanimous approval of President Roosevelt's war programme and called on the Government to take emergency steps against the destructive activities of the Fascist elements, the Ku-Klux-Klan and other bodies fomenting racial conflicts.

The C.I.O. has constantly attacked the reactionaries in the Democratic and Republican camps who are hampering the efforts of the United States Government. In its own ranks it is fighting to get rid of all disorganisers who try to disrupt it from within, and is striving for greater consolidation in the definition of its political ideas and plans. The principal political decisions adopted by the C.I.O. voiced the sentiments not only of its own rank and file, but of a large section of the rank and file of the A.F. of L. and the Railway Brotherhood. And this warrants the assumption that the reactionary A.F. of L. leadership—Matthew Woll, Hutchinson, Dubinsky and the rest—will not be able to keep down the increasing desire of the membership for national and international trade union unity.

The American trade union movement has wide and promising prospects open before it, and it will depend on the political sense and tact and also on the organisational ability of its progressive elements to make the most of them in the interests of the working-class—interests which today are identical with the general national interests of the United States and of all freedom-loving nations.

ATTENTION!

The armed forces abroad want to keep in touch. Why not take out a subscription on their behalf? See page 52.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Agriculture in 1944

by JACK DUNMAN

IN eight months time we shall be beginning to gather in the fifth war-time harvest. It can be confidently hoped that by then we shall be sharing in the responsibility for feeding many of the countries now occupied by the Nazis. U.N.R.R.A. has estimated that occupied Europe will need 46 million tons of supplies in the first six months of freedom, including seven million tons of food, and this leaves out of account the needs of starving India and the rest of Asia.

This problem may arise at a time when the pressure on shipping space for military purposes is still acute, and we cannot exclude the possibility that our own home stocks of food may be reduced by enemy action in the last and fiercest stages of the war. British Agriculture, 1944, is therefore still a front-line war industry, and it is as such that its achievements, plans, and needs must be estimated.

The features of the situation which require examination against this background are the following:—

1. A certain turn in the Government's policy away from the production of maximum human food to meet the needs of the immediate situation, and towards preoccupation with post-war problems in the narrower sense;
2. Moves by the Ministry of Agriculture towards more active encouragement of co-operation among farmers.
3. The fight of the farm workers, led by the N.U.A.W., for the £4 minimum wage; in connection with which the granting of the 5s. increase to 65s. must be regarded as a victory for the employers, though it is to be hoped, a temporary one.
4. The consequent "row" now in progress between the farmers and the Ministry of Agriculture around the farmers' demand for an increase in the price of farm produce to meet the increased wages bill;
5. The series of "post-war policies," of which that of the Labour Party, published in December, is the first comprehensive study of the subject from the labour movement, or indeed from any progressive source.

All these are closely connected with each other and must be taken into account in estimating the present and future needs of the industry.

The turn in Government policy is illustrated by the contrast between Mr. Hudson's statement in May, 1943, that the tillage area (i.e., the area under crops, as distinct from grass, whether leys or permanent pasture) must be still further increased, and at the end of July, when he announced that the limit of tillage area had been reached. Since then, concessions have been made to some of the Western counties (following genuine difficulties due to exceptionally heavy and continuous rain during the harvest months), actually reducing their ploughing quotas, and reports from several counties show that the War Agricultural Executive Committees are easing up on their control of crops, and leaving it more to the individual farmers to decide what they will grow. Some much-needed, and in many respects excellent, plans have been introduced to improve the quality of our livestock and increase milk production; but the propaganda and explanation around them has been badly put, and there is some excuse for farmers interpreting it as the "all clear" for them to start concentrating on the rebuilding of their livestock herds.

Altogether, the continued need to save every ton of shipping space; the fact that the safety of our invading armies will depend on shipping; and the needs of the liberated peoples, as well as the Indian famine, seem to be being allowed to recede into the background. There is need for the clearest understanding of the new demands for shipping, and the stark fact must be understood that for some time the needs of the liberated peoples will not be vitamins and beefsteaks to improve their nutrition, but calories—in the form of potatoes and corn—to keep the greatest number of them alive.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These things must be put squarely to the industry; if they are understood, arguments as to whether it is safe to use up a little of the fertility of our soil for another year or two, whether yields per acre are, or are not, showing a slight tendency to fall;* whether, in fact, the industry can keep going without vastly increased supplies of farmyard manure, will fall into their proper perspective. *The situation still demands the maximum production of food for direct human consumption, because when food is short, that is the most economical way to use the land, and the Government ought to intensify, not relax, its efforts to that end.*

That is not to say that much cannot be done at the same time to improve the quality of our livestock and to see that they are used to exploit fully leys, the permanent grass that cannot be ploughed, and the fodder crops necessary in the rotation.

This is the main immediate problem, but it is closely linked with the other points we have enumerated.

In the first place, it is noteworthy that as long as the farmers were asked for more, they gladly gave it. It is now that they are being asked for less, and actually encouraged to believe that their post-war position is the chief thing to think about, that relations between them and the Government have become strained. The points around which the quarrel has developed are the demands for reduced ploughing quotas from farmers in the Western counties, where the harvest rainfall was exceptional, which have been agreed to only in certain cases, and the demand that the total increase in the wages bill, as calculated by the farmers, caused by the wage increases won by the farm workers, should be met by an equivalent rise in the prices of farm produce. Mr. Hudson has replied, probably with some justice, but certainly without much tact, that the income of the farming community has in fact increased considerably more than the Government even expected, and that they must be content with certain readjustments and a nett increase of £2½ million against their claim for £13 million. Hence, Mr. Hudson's name is mud.

But what is a much more serious and fundamental cause of discontent is the deep rooted fear on the part of the farmers for their future, based on bitter memories of the catastrophe which overtook agriculture in 1920, when demand slumped, prices tumbled, farmers went bankrupt, wages were slashed, and the workers left the land. Mr. Hudson has announced that conversations are taking place; but the delay has exasperated the farmers, who feel already—and this applies especially and with absolute justice to the small farmers—that the Government has set them numerous tasks, but given them little concrete help in carrying them out. If they have not had enough help in the war, how can they expect it in the post-war years? And this is a question of absolute survival for the small farmers, who form the majority of farmers as a class.

In this connection the recent moves by the Ministry of Agriculture to encourage co-operation among farmers is very significant, and is one of the most hopeful features in the whole situation. It is remarkable that a development so excellent should be receiving so little publicity. Nevertheless, it appears definite from various announcements, that the Ministry is in favour of the extension of Machinery Pooling Schemes, which had in the past been operated successfully in one or two counties as a result of the local initiative of the W.A.E.C., and it can be assumed that steps will be taken to encourage their extension to all counties.

Such Pools not only greatly improve the use of machinery, and make it available to small farmers, who have not been

* An article by Mr. C. T. Ward in the *Farmers' Weekly* for December 31st suggests that they do not; "It is difficult to find a farmer who can show that his land is in poorer heart than it was before the war. Most of them express quite the opposite opinion," is his conclusion.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to purchase for themselves; but they can rapidly develop almost all other forms of co-operation known to agriculture, such as joint purchase of requirements; joint sale of products; joint use of labour; establishment of village granaries and fertiliser stores. In Bucks they have led to excellently attended machinery demonstrations, with full co-operation of the farm-workers; and there is no reason why they should not take over some of the functions, such as allocation of crop quotas, from the District Committees which operate under the W.A.E.Cs., and which are often extremely unsatisfactory. Further, the participation of the farm workers in these pools, which is the rule rather than the exception, provides the form in which Joint Production Committees can most easily develop in agriculture.

This machinery pooling must be looked upon not only as an immediate aid to increased food production to meet the war situation, but as absolutely vital as a means of survival for the small farmers after the war, and as a means for enabling them to benefit from machinery and large-scale production without being forced to lose their own identity.

In this whole situation, the publication of the Labour Party's policy for post-war agriculture, *Our Land—the Future of British Agriculture*—is important. An increasing number of farmers are coming to see that their future is tied up with a rising standard of life for the masses; here is the first detailed statement of how the labour movement, representing the masses, intends to deal with their industry. The clear demand for nationalisation of the land, which differentiates the policy from all the others which have so far been issued, will be welcomed by all who understand how the landlord system has broken down, and constitutes the main obstacle to the full restoration of our agriculture. Concrete and practical proposals for compensation are put forward in a way that will dispose of many doubts and questions. Many farmers, embarrassed by debt to the banks if they are owner-occupiers, or unable to get capital assistance from their private landlord, will welcome this forthright treatment, none the less because the N.F.U. in their report did not have the courage to accept the principle.

On the specific question of the small farmers, to which we have referred, the statement is less satisfactory and would be strengthened if it included proposals for the large-scale encouragement of co-operation.

The statement includes what amounts to a charter of demands for the farm workers designed to bring their wages and conditions up to the level of skilled workers in the towns. This brings us to the last feature of the present situation, and one of the most important, namely, the campaign of the farm workers for the £4 national minimum wage. This demand was turned down a few months ago, and a beggarly increase of 5s. to 65s. a week granted. The N.U.A.W., however, has made it clear that it intends to continue to campaign for its full demand. Support for the campaign is one of the most urgent tasks facing the whole labour movement; it affects the post-war position no less closely than the immediate drive for production.

The farm workers, the variety of whose skill and experience, and the arduousness of whose work is second to no other section of the workers, have had to put up with conditions unknown to all others, and in many parts of the country to face conditions of tyranny and oppression, with its inevitable effect on production. The granting of this just claim will be a stimulus to the great effort demanded by the closing stages of the war.

The labour movement should remember that after the last war, the farm workers were the first to have their wages and organisation attacked. Successful resistance to any such attacks this time can not only safeguard the position of all the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other workers, but can be the signal for a victorious general advance. The £4 campaign is the first round in this struggle, and the farm workers are entitled to all the help that they can get.

* * *

It is all the more interesting to note that after a long discussion between local small farmers and a representative of the urban labour movement some weeks ago, about the vexed question of the plough-up and other grievances, one of the farmers finally said: "If the W.A.E.C. provided us with the necessary, it might be possible to grow food in this area;" clearly illustrating the correctness of the line of fighting for more help from the Government and the W.A.E.Cs.

These, then, would seem to be the most urgent needs facing the movement as far as agriculture is concerned.

First, an effort to put before the industry the urgent needs on the food front which the offensive will produce, and the imperative necessity for no falling off in our efforts to produce the maximum possible amount of food.

Second, fullest support for the farm workers' wage campaign, which means not only the passing of resolutions but active help in building up the labour movement, including the Trade Unions, the Labour Party and the Communist Party in the countryside.

Third, a vigorous campaign for the post-war policy of the Labour Party, coupled with efforts to put forward proposals, especially for co-operation both now and in the future, which will win the small farmers for support of the labour movement.

If this work is not done, it is hard to see how labour can ever win power in this country. Carried out with energy, enthusiasm and imagination, along with the efforts of the urban and industrial workers, it can guarantee the victory of all that we are fighting for.

Students and the War

by VAL WALKER

IT is customary these days to read in the papers, and to hear on the radio, accounts of the heroism of the students of Europe and China in the struggle against Fascism; in fact, it is clear that students are playing a foremost part in the fight. Many people in this country, whose only experience of students was gained in the General Strike, are unable to reconcile these stories with their conception of students as the reactionary sons and daughters of the ruling and upper-middle classes, whose only interest in politics is to break up progressive meetings and to scab on the working-class.

It would, however, be a profound mistake to underestimate the extent of the changes in the outlook of students, or the contribution—immediate and potential—which they are making to the progressive forces in this country. The last decade has seen big developments amongst the middle sections of the British people, for thousands of them have turned to working-class methods of organisation in defence of their interests and additional thousands have taken a leading part in the struggle against Fascism and war. The Labour and Communist Parties have attracted increasing numbers of professional and small business people, who were content in the past to live lives of individualist pseudo-security, isolated from the main stream of progressive activity. They have been shocked out of this complacent attitude by the twin menaces of capitalist crisis and Fascism, and found that the security they falsely believed they held, could only be grasped firmly by continuous struggle.

It is not surprising, therefore, to see the development of such organisations as the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Association of Scientific Workers; to note the growing unity and strength of the teachers' organisations, or to understand the desire of the Civil Servants to become part of the T.U.C. Nor should it be surprising that the students, influenced by the same factors as have produced these changes within the rest of the middle strata, should be found today taking a united stand against Fascism, devoting their energies to the political, social and military struggle, and organising alongside the progressive forces for social security and reconstruction.

Just as every other aspect of our national life, the universities and colleges have undergone great changes during the past four years. For the first time in their history there has been introduced into the higher educational system, a degree of national planning and co-ordination. It is clearly impossible to fight a war against the highly developed machine of the Nazis, without a large number of trained personnel in every field, and particularly in science and technology. The Government have given bursaries in scientific subjects to a wide range of pupils from secondary schools, the only requirement being that they shall show academic and technical promise. As a result the provincial universities and technical colleges are filled with keen and intelligent people from the middle and working-classes.

Many of the changes in higher education have been brought about by these students themselves, who have gone much farther than either the Government or the academic authorities in their efforts to make their contribution to the war a more valuable one. They realised very soon that the only way to make full use of the universities and colleges was to put them completely on a war footing. They have had to fight old-established traditions, the conservatism of many university teachers, and the reluctance of the Government to make any radical changes in the basis of higher education.

The most important academic campaign has been carried on over the issue of the "Fourth Term." In normal times there is a vacation of three months from July-September, and the student movement, together with many senior members of the universities, fought to insert an extra term into this vacation. The introduction of such a term would mean that the ordinary course, usually taking three years, could be completed in two years and three months, and hence the production of trained personnel would be speeded up immensely. In several universities and colleges this fourth term has been won, with obvious helpful results to the war effort, and in practically every place engineering students work on this system. The campaign is continuing, for the students are determined that every ounce of value shall be gained from their colleges.

Everywhere academic problems arise during the war and have to be solved. The men have to spend a great deal of time in intensive military training, and this necessitates careful timing of lectures and examinations: all colleges and universities are distinctly understaffed and the numbers of science, technical and medical students have increased: modern advances require rejuvenation of the courses, some of which were outdated and over-complicated by their historical development. These problems, and a wide variety of others, have often been dealt with by staff-student committees which, as college equivalent of the joint production committee, help both staff and students to use the resources of the institution to the best advantage. They have, together with the student societies, encouraged higher standards of study, and in many colleges extra lectures and discussion groups are organised by them, thus enabling the weaker students to gain a better understanding of their subject. Finally, a beginning has been made to break down the pedantic isolation of the study of a particular branch of knowledge from the body of associated subjects and their links to human society. Students have long since discovered that text-book science or lecture-room economics only become

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

valuable when they are seen in relation to the problems of mankind. This attitude has meant that in every college discussions are held on the social implications of the various subjects.

The improvement of their academic work, although the most important contribution made by students to the war effort, is by no means the only one. All men do military training, and in many places it is compulsory for women students to spend time in some form of war service. In one university the women are trained in first-aid and nursing, in another they run a workshop within the college under the orders of a local factory, and a full twenty-four hours run is maintained. Some students do night-shifts in local factories, help in canteens, work on buses and trams, or clean hospital wards. The greatest collective effort was recently made during the summer, when the N.U.S. organised camps for land-workers under the Ministry of Agriculture and hundreds of students helped to bring in the harvest.

It will be seen that the break with 1926 is complete. In the intervening years students have acquired a real sense of responsibility to the community, and are anxious to be of the maximum value to the people. This is clearly brought out too, in the political activity of the student movement today. While it is the University Labour Federation which first raises and campaigns for popular demands, such as the Second Front, freedom for India, the Beveridge Report, etc.; most of these issues command far wider support than merely that of the socialist students, and, in fact, many are adopted at the most representative mass gatherings—the annual Congresses of the National Union of Students. The latter has a policy on student issues which now includes educational reform along the lines advocated by the Council for Educational Advance, a student health programme based on the adoption of the Beveridge Report and many other important progressive points. It is driving forward with a democratic programme for the reform of the universities and colleges, and the student movement regards this and its other problems, not in a narrow academic way, but from the viewpoint of the progressive forward development of our country as a whole.

One of the most important current campaigns of the N.U.S. is centred round the International Student Fund, which is an anti-Fascist fund for the relief of students and universities which have suffered in the fight against Fascism. Through the activity around this Fund, the overwhelming mass of the students are expressing their solidarity with their comrades abroad, and their determination to assist them to throw off without further delay the yoke of the invader. This was the spirit also of the International Student Day celebrations this year, when, on November 17, students throughout the world met to affirm their conviction that this must be "the last International Student Day held under war conditions."

Students are sensible of the fact that they are the most privileged section of the youth of this country. They value the democracy and freedom of expression of the student movement sufficiently to wish to see the rest of the young people of this country enjoy similar facilities. There is great indignation, for instance, against the Government's ban on political youth organisations taking part in Youth Service, for in the universities it is the accepted thing to belong to political organisations. In order to help the youth to win a better and more joyous life, students are playing an increasing part in the youth movement as a whole. In particular they are fighting for such educational reform as will give every young person the opportunity of a university education. The slogan, "Towards People's Universities," which was originated by the U.L.F., now expresses the aim of the entire student movement. The Trade Union of the staff, the Association of University Teachers, is also interesting itself in projects for far-reaching univer-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sity reforms. Together, the N.U.S. and A.U.T. can make a very significant contribution to the demand of the people for a democratic system of higher education.

We have shown the student movement already taking its place alongside the labour movement on all the outstanding issues of the day. What, then, is its future? The student movement itself is, in fact, in transition from being a purely university student body to being a really representative movement embracing students from all types of higher educational institutes. Already the N.U.S. is gaining affiliations from a large number of technical, training, art, and domestic science colleges. The influx of thousands of young people from these colleges, with their predominantly working-class background, and their fresh approach, will increase enormously the tempo of the advance of the student movement.

It is clear, then, that the labour movement can look with confidence to the students to stand foursquare behind the workers and all progressive forces in the final battles against Fascism, and in the difficult days of reconstruction. From their ranks will come the forces which will further develop the professional Trades Unions and associations, and work to bring these closer to the organised Labour movement. The leading members of the Socialist Societies and University Labour Federation will be a direct reserve of leading cadres for the working-class cause. The student movement itself will be a foremost fighter for the youth, and will take part in all developments which aim to advance the cause of young people, and to break down the barriers between the privileged and the frustrated. This student movement is an ally worthy of our great labour movement, and one whose development workers and progressive people in all walks of life should encourage and assist.

Book Reviews

The Colonies

The Future of Colonial Peoples by Lord Hailey. Lectures delivered to Princeton University, U.S.A., February, 1943 (Ooxford University Press).

The Colonies (Labour Party Executive, March, 1943).

AS VICTORY approaches, the future of the colonies is increasingly discussed. The unity of the many former colonial nations of the Soviet Union with the Russian nation has deeply impressed the British people; and now voices are loudly raised proposing all sorts of "solutions' 'for the colonial "problem"—any and every "solution" except the Socialist solution of liberation.

Two "solutions" are particularly publicised: First, that there be international supervision of the administrations of all colonies; this is proposed in the Labour Party Executive's statement on post-war colonial policy. Second, that colonies be grouped into regions, each under a co-ordinating council of representatives of all the powers possessing colonies in that region or having other interests there; this is favoured by Lord Hailey. Both "solutions" leave the colonies in the hands of the present possessing powers.

Except for one very casual reference in the Labour statement, both it and Lord Hailey ignore the lessons provided by Soviet national policy. Both, on the contrary, are at pains to deny that Africans are, or for a long time will be, capable of governing themselves—so that Europeans must needs continue to govern them (for their own good, of course). Both consider Africans unable to understand the electoral system, and ignore the democracy of most tribal life. Neither mentions that natives of some Siberian tribes, such as the Nentsy or Samoyeds ("Cannibals"), who twenty years ago were quite as primitive as any in Africa, today not only run their own affairs but help to legislate for the whole Soviet Union as members of the Supreme Soviet and as high State functionaries. There is no Kikuyu in the Kenya legislature, let alone in the British Parliament. No African colonial people has any voice in the government of its own country.

The Labour Executive and Lord Hailey quite frankly fear the enfranchisement of the Africans because it would give them a more powerful vote than Europeans in Africa. Thus the Executive's statement says: "When the time comes at which it is possible to introduce a franchise for Africans on the same terms as for Europeans . . . appropriate measures may have to be taken constitutionally (!) to safeguard the legitimate (!) rights of non-indigenous communities." That is, the franchise will be a sham. There is no understanding of the brotherhood uniting the Russian and non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, where in Russian

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

areas there is no oppression of non-Russians and in non-Russian areas there is no oppression of Russians.

Neither Lord Hailey nor the Executive fully recognises that only complete liberation can erase the conflict between Africans and Europeans. As Father Schebesta has admitted (*My Pigmy and Negro Hosts*), the African has been imbued with such hatred and distrust of Europeans, that Europeans can hardly introduce genuinely beneficial schemes: only a free African administration could do it. Only a free African administration could have fully mobilised Africans in support of the present war against Fascism as the free administrations of Soviet peoples have done. Lord Hailey does admit that this view exists, but he adds that "it will find many powerful interests aligned against it." Presumably for this reason he plumps for regional councils, while the native peoples "might" find a place—not on the councils themselves, indeed, but on mere advisory committees attached to them.

Similarly the supervisory Mandates Commissions proposed by the Labour Party Executive might hear complaints from the native peoples, but no natives would be members and there is no suggestion of early enfranchisement and responsible government.

Do Lord Hailey and the Labour Party Executive believe Africans will consider that such proposals fulfil the Atlantic Charter?

G. P.

Racial Theory Exposed

There Are No Aryans—The Racial Theory Exposed by R. Page Arnot. (Labour Monthly, 6*d*).

ONE OF the most pernicious features of the Nazi propaganda is racialism, the idea of the superior race. This racialism is expressed not only against the Jews, but has been shown particularly against the people of African and Asiatic descent. It was pronounced at the Olympic Sports held in Berlin in 1936, when they refused to recognise the victory of an American negro who had won a series of important races.

We must fight all expressions of racialism wherever they appear. They are dangerous signs and harbingers of Fascism.

Examples of this have shown themselves in this country (the obvious Fascist expressions in the East End and other parts of London, with anti-semitic slogans: Mr. and Mrs. Leary Constantine and their daughter asked to leave the Imperial Hotel on account of their colour). This studied insult came as a shock to many people,. It is clear that public opinion must be roused to the dangers of such reprehensible actions.

A study of the racial theory is essential, and the very valuable and well-written pamphlet by R. Page Arnot, *There Are No Aryans—The Racial Theory Exposed*, published by LABOUR MONTHLY, price 6d., is just the weapon to help in combating the development of race hatred in this country.

Mr. Arnot concludes this valuable pamphlet with a serious warning.

"It is not enough to penetrate the fallacies of Nazi "race-theory" unless this is applied to the rooting out of prejudices that are widespread in this country against particular groups, as can be measured by the all-too-frequent use of such contemptuous terms as "nigger" or "dago" or "yid." Especially in the case of Jews is this prejudice dangerous to the cause of democracy. . . . For the racial theory as one of Hitler's weapons is not limited in its use to the occupied countries of Europe. It is a weapon used extensively in this country and in the U.S.A. Therefore there is no sincere and consistent fight for democracy against Fascism unless it also takes the shape of a fight within this country against racialism or race-exclusiveness."

BEN BRADLEY.

Shorter Notices

Der Wez zu einem neuen Deutschland edited by Heinrich Fraenkel (Lindsay, Drummond, 2*s*6*d*).

THIS BOOK was recently published in English under the title "Germany's Road to Democracy;" the present is the German edition. It contains the views of the steps necessary for German reconstruction expressed by representative anti-Nazis—a Social Democrat, a Communist, a Liberal, a scientist, a pastor and a woman. With this "plan" and that for Germany's future being put forward from various sides it is well to be reminded that ultimately the rebuilding of Germany to take her place in a world order pledged to ensure peace is the task of the German people. This book shows that there are forces prepared to work together for this end.

J. H. H.

American Labour Split and Allied Unity by Bryn Roberts (Lawrence & Wishart, 5*s*).

THE AUTHOR, who is General Secretary of the National Union of Public Employees, was one of the fraternal delegates of the Trades Union Congress to the Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labour in October, 1942. In this book he gives an account of the relations between the A.F. of L. and the Congress of Industrial Organisations from the formation of the latter body up to the present time. The attitude of antagonism taken up by the A.F. of L. towards the Soviet Trade Unions has proved a major difficulty in reaching unity between the labour organisations of the Allied nations and has resulted in their recent refusal to join in the World Trade Union Conference called by the Trades Union Congress. It is, therefore, particularly valuable to have the facts set out by Bryn Roberts now when international co-operation of the labour movement is essential both for the winning of the war and for advance in the period of reconstruction afterwards.

J. H. H.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in January, 1944 : £72 : 8 : 7

ONE HUNDRED NEEDED MONTHLY !

The total sum collected during the course of 1943 was £875 6s. 2d., £25 less than in 1942. In spite of this shortage, we managed to finish the year without an overdraft, and wish to thank all those generous friends who made this possible. At the same time we must draw all readers' attention to our financial position, and point out once again that, with the present system of paper rationing, it is impossible to balance our budget on L.M. sales alone.

This January's total, although not exactly a flying start, is a very great advance on last January's, and if we can only keep working to increase this monthly sum until we reach, but do not stop at, the required minimum of £100, an equally satisfactory position will be arrived at during the present year.

	£	s.	d.
J. D. U.		3	0
R. Sleep		2	6
S. Fischer		13	0
A. Wall		5	0
F. Cracknell		2	0
E. McCallum		5	0
J. Smith		4	0
J. McQueen		3	0
D. Rees		13	0
J. Burnip		10	0
J. Railly		2	0
Old Age Pensioner			6
Symphony Orchestra	3	15	0
R. Green		3	0
Telemech, R.E.M.E.		10	0
A Herts Reader		12	5
A. Neville		1	6
V. Vergauwen		6	0
D. Strathern & Friends		8	0
H. Eldridge		13	0
C. Levy	1	13	0
G. Ramsay		6	6
G. Sargent		3	0
A. Orba		1	0
D. Oakeshott		5	0
Anon, London	1	0	0
Coventry Comsomol		2	0
Morden D.G.		5	0
A. Taylor		13	0
F. Birchenough	1	0	0
D.29		2	6
Scottish Reader	5	0	0
P. O. E. U.		14	0
J. Scott		3	6
R. Somen		1	0
E. Waller		7	0
H. Clark		8	0
B. Vickery		2	6
A. Bruce		1	0
R. Barrett		5	0
D. Cass		2	6
S. Clegg		7	6
W. Dawson		2	0
L. Clark		14	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
G. Philibert		10	0
A. Lloyd-Williams	6	0	0
S. Mill		10	0
G. Harrison		10	0
P. Brown		1	0
Sgt. Locke		2	6
D. Tannert		10	0
J. Fraser	1	0	0
Subscriber, Lincoln		10	0
Acton Communist Teachers Group	1	0	0
G. Harrison	1	0	0
N. Kelly		5	0
Washwood Heath D.G.		5	0
L. Croker		3	0
A. P. D. G.		10	0
E. Ashworth		5	0
J. Turner		4	0
H. Davies		5	4
9th Army Air Force	1	0	0
F. Bradbury		1	6
J. Trott		6	0
H. Horne		2	6
J. McQueen		2	6
Smoke		10	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
R. Mecredy		10	0
Director	2	0	0
W. Breach	1	0	0
E. Guter		2	6
J. Leith		5	0
J. McLean		2	6
J. Jury		2	0
B. Davies		6	6
Cleveland, Ohio	2	0	0
E. Edwards		7	0
A.T.S.		6	10
W. Hunt		6	6
Penrith D.G.		10	0
A. Humphrey		2	0
G. Robertson		3	0
Eric and Norah		10	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
J. B.		5	0
Radio Mech.,R.E.M.E.		3	0
H. Grenfell		14	0
L'Humanite		2	0
Learner		2	0
D. Glover		3	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
R. Oliver		1	0
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
Q. Z.		12	0
M. Lipetz		13	0
W. Harries		5	0
K. H.			6
P. Sayles		3	0
F. Rush		2	0
T. Chapman		1	6
J. Turner		4	0
J. Atkinson		5	0
R. E. M. E.		10	0
F. Overington		2	6
E. Manning		10	0
Berry & Walters		8	0
J. Bacon		4	0
J. Rattray		2	6
A. McCormack		10	0
N. Freedman		3	0
N. Smith		4	0
R. Pearson		5	0
M. Merrall		13	0
R. Barrett		7	0
W. Maddison	1	0	0
P. Pearman		5	0
J. Hunter		7	0
E. Reckitt	5	0	0
L. Drewitt		5	0
B. C.		15	0
Russophile		10	0
G. Sargent		5	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
P. Davies		3	0
M. Price		3	0
Morpeth D.G.		5	0
P. Morris		1	0
H. Brookes		3	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A History of ANGLO-SOVIET RELATIONS

W. P. and Zelda K. Coates

Foreword by the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George

Traces the course of relations from 1918, through difficulties and disagreements to the present days of triumphant alliance

Publication : February 18

18/-

Lawrence & Wishart Ltd

and **Pilot Press Ltd**

ORDER NOW—

THE SOVIET WORKER LOOKS AT THE WAR

96 pp. 2/6 (Post 2d.)

In this book will be found the main articles from issues of the Soviet Trade Union magazine : "War and the Working Class." Its four sections deal respectively with :—

I. The Anti-Hitlerite Coalition and its Policy.
II. Post-War Problems.
III. Problems of separate countries.
IV. Trade Union Problems.

Obtainable everywhere, or direct from the Publishers—

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PROPERTY OF CPGB LIBRARY
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED